

REMARKS:

Reconsideration of this application and the rejection of claims 2-10 are respectfully requested. Applicant has attempted to address every objection and ground for rejection in the Office Action dated November 25, 2008 (Paper No. 20081121) and believes the application is now in condition for allowance. The claims have been amended to more clearly describe the present invention.

In the Action, the Examiner objects to the claimed amendments in the Response to the previous Office Action. The Examiner states that the amendments introduce new matter. Specifically, the Examiner states that the terms “biasing device,” “neutral position” and “accommodating position” are not supported in the specification. Applicant has amended the claims to change these terms to terms that are supported in the specification. In particular, the term “biasing device” has been changed to “spring.” The term “spring” is supported in the specification, for example, at page 5, lines 1-6. The term “neutral position” has been changed to be a “middle position” or a “position,” which is supported in the specification at page 6, lines 3-19. Further, the term “accommodating position” has been changed to be “locked position,” which is supported in the specification at page 6, lines 10-13. Applicant submits that the amendments to the claims are supported in the specification and Applicant respectfully requests that the objection under 35 U.S.C. §132(a) be withdrawn.

Claims 2-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. Specifically, the Examiner states that the terms “biasing device” and “neutral middle position” are not supported in the specification. As discussed above, Applicant has amended the claims to change these terms to terms that are supported in the specification. Applicant therefore submits that the amendments to the claims overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112.

Claims 2-10 are also rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. The Examiner states that the phrase, “one or the other of the two grooves” in claims 8 and 9 lack sufficient antecedent basis. The Examiner also states that claim 10 is rejected because the term “accommodating position” is not clear. Applicant has amended these claims to correct the antecedent basis issue and change the term “accommodating position” to be “locked position” as supported in the specification. Accordingly, Applicant submits that the rejection of claims 2-10 under §112, second paragraph, has been overcome and requests that this rejection be withdrawn.

Applicant submits that in view of the above-identified amendments and remarks, the claims in their present form are patentably distinct over the art of record. Allowance of the rejected claims is respectfully requested. Should the Examiner discover

Appl. No. 10/580,735  
Amdt. Dated February 25, 2009  
Reply to Office Action of November 25, 2008

that there are remaining issues which may be resolved by a telephone interview, she is invited to contact Applicant's undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

GREER, BURNS & CRAIN, LTD.

By /Christopher S. Hermanson/  
Christopher S. Hermanson  
Registration No. 48,244

**Customer No. 24978**  
February 25, 2009  
300 S. Wacker Drive – Suite 2500  
Chicago, Illinois 60606-6501  
Telephone: (312) 360-0080  
Facsimile: (312) 360-9315